

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of two Advisory Actions respectively dated May 18, 2007 and May 29, 2007. Claims 1, 3 to 5 and 7 to 27 are in the application, of which Claims 1, 22, 23 and 27 are the independent claims. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

The Advisory Actions indicated that the of-record rejections would be maintained. Thus, in the Advisory Actions, all claims remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent 7,020,773 (Otway) in view of U.S. Patent 7,062,651 (Lapstun).

With respect, Applicants continue to traverse the rejections. With regard to independent Claims 1, 22 and 27, a user-specific key pair is obtained from a key function call which is supported by an operating system executing in a computing device. These claims have been amended to specify that the key function call is also provided with user login information, for verification of the user's authorization to use the computing device, thus emphasizing the close coordination between user and device so as to obtain secure storage according to the invention. The Office Action relies on Otway's Figure 1, and column 1, lines 40 to 67, as allegedly disclosing the key function calls as set out in the claims. Applicants respectfully maintain that these portions of Otway disclose nothing concerning key function calls that are supported by an operating system executing in the computing device, and certainly disclose nothing concerning the provision of user login information to the key function call for verification of a user's authorization to use the computing device.

It is therefore respectfully submitted that the rejection of Claims 1, 22 and 27 should be withdrawn.

With respect to independent Claim 23, which again has not been amended, the Advisory Action indicates adherence to the USPTO's position that Otway teaches the presentation of a key to a user for the user to enter it on another device. In support of this position, the USPTO cites to Otway's column 3, line 1 to 30, and column 5, lines 20 to 60. These sections have been reviewed again, but Applicants find nothing in these sections that indicate that a printer key hash is obtained from a "test page" printed by a printer, and that the printer key hash is input into the computing device by a user-input means connected to the computing device.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 23 is respectfully requested.

Concerning a formal matter involving the Information Disclosure Statement dated May 1, 2007, it is respectfully requested for the Examiner to consider the cited art thereof, and to signify his consideration of this art.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, CA office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Michael K. O'Neill", is written over a horizontal line.

Attorney for Applicants
Michael K. O'Neill
Registration No. 32,622

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

FCHS_WS 1431018v1